



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/782,273	02/19/2004	William L. Grilliot	MOR3334P0991US	4238
32116	7590	06/09/2005		EXAMINER
WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ, CLARK & MORTIMER 500 W. MADISON STREET SUITE 3800 CHICAGO, IL 60661				HOEY, ALISSA L
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				3765

DATE MAILED: 06/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/782,273	GRILLIOT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alissa L. Hoey	3765	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 March 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-5,7-13,15 and 16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-5,7-13,15 and 16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. This is in response to a request for continued examination received on 03/10/05.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7- 9 and 11-13, 15, 16 have been amended and claims 6 and 14 have been cancelled. Claims 1-5, 7-13, 15 and 16 have been rejected below.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1-5 and 9-13 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,892,394. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because, US 6,892,394 teaches a method for protecting a military or paramilitary firefighter or emergency worker wherein the method comprises providing the military or paramilitary firefighter or emergency worker with a protective garment. The protective garment is a coat, trousers, overalls, or coveralls which are reversible and has a shell of high visibility and a shell of low visibility which is

Art Unit: 3765

wearable with either shell facing outwardly. The shell of high visibility has portions that are reflective, fluorescent or both, which portions face outwardly when the protective garment is worn so that the shell of high visibility faces outwardly. Wherein if a tactical situation, in which a need for low visibility overrides a need for high visibility, develops or is expected to develop, the emergency worker wearing the protective garment with the shell of high visibility facing outwardly is motivated to doff the protective garment to reverse the protective garment and to re-don the protective garment with the shell of low visibility facing outwardly (see claims 1 and 7). Further, US 6,892,394 teaches portions provided by reflective trim affixed to the shell of high visibility (see claims 2 and 8). The shell of low visibility appears dark in ambient light when facing outwardly (see claims 3 and 9). The shell of low visibility appears black in ambient light when facing outwardly (see claims 7 and 10). The shell of low visibility displays camouflage when facing outwardly (see claims 5 and 11).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-5, 7-13, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aldridge (US 5,933,865).

In regard to claim 1, Aldridge provides a protective garment (10) for protecting a military or paramilitary firefighter or emergency worker (column 1, lines 32-64). The protective garment of Aldridge is a coat (10). The protective garment (10) is capable of being reversible and has a shell of high visibility (16) and a shell of low visibility (inside of 14) depending upon what color the reverse is and what situation you are in. The garment (10) is wearable with either shell facing outwardly and the shell of high visibility has portions of reflective material (30) that faces outwardly when the protective garment is worn so that the shell of high visibility faces outwardly.

The garment of Aldridge is capable of being worn in a tactical situation wherein a need for low visibility overrides a need for high visibility develops or is expected to develop. The military or paramilitary firefighter or emergency worker wearing the protective garment with the shell of high visibility facing outwardly is capable of being motivated to doff the protective garment, to reverse the protective garment, and to redon the protective garment with the shell of low visibility facing outwardly.

In regard to claim 2, Aldridge teaches portions are provided by reflective trim affixed to the shell of high visibility (30).

In regard to claims 3 and 10, Aldridge teaches a garment for protecting a firefighter as described above in this office action (see claim 1). The garment of Aldridge is capable of being used in the method of claims 3 and 10, since the structural limitations of the garment used in the method are provided by Aldridge and therefore it is capable of being used in the method as described.

However, with regard to the shell of low visibility appearing dark in ambient light, Aldridge teaches a liner that is capable of being worn as the outside surface and the appearance of the shell depends upon the degree of ambient light provided. Any color can appear dark when the lighting is low and only silhouettes are visible. Therefore, the inside of the liner worn as the outside surface is capable of appearing dark when in ambient light.

In regard to claims 4 and 12, Aldridge teaches a garment for protecting a firefighter as described above in this office action (see claim 1). The garment of Aldridge is capable of being used in the method of claims 4 and 12, since the structural limitations of the garment used in the method are provided by Aldridge and therefore it is capable of being used in the method as described.

However, with regard to the shell of low visibility appearing dark in ambient light, Aldridge teaches a liner that is capable of being worn as the outside surface and the appearance of the shell depends upon the degree of ambient light provided. Any color can appear black when the lighting is low and only silhouettes are visible. Therefore, the inside of the liner worn as the outside surface is capable of appearing black when in ambient light.

In regard to claim 5 and 13, Aldridge teaches a garment for protecting a firefighter as described above in this office action (see claim 1). The garment of Aldridge is capable of being used in the method of claims 5 and 13, since the structural limitations of the garment used in the method are provided by Aldridge and therefore it is capable of being used in the method as described.

However, Aldridge fails to teach the shell of low visibility displays camouflage.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have provided the shell of low visibility displaying camouflage because Applicant has not disclosed that the shell of low visibility displaying camouflage provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with the shell of low visibility being camouflage or any other color because as long as it appears dark or black in ambient light any color or pattern would comply and would have equivalent structure.

In regard to claims 7, 8, 15 and 16, Aldridge fails to teach the shells being similar in basis weights or equal in basis weights.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have provided the shells being similar or equal in basis weights because Applicant has not disclosed that the shells being similar or equal in basis weights provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with the shells being equal, similar or different in basis weights because as long as there is one shell of high visibility and one shell of low visibility the weight of each is structurally equivalent.

In regard to claim 9, Aldridge provides a coat garment (10) for protecting a military or paramilitary firefighter or emergency worker that comprises a shell that is capable of being reversed from a shell of high visibility (16) to a shell of low visibility

(inside of 14). The garment is capable of being worn with either shell facing outwards.

The shell of high visibility (16) has portions that are reflective (30) and face outwardly when the protective garment is worn so that the shell of high visibility faces outwardly.

The garment of Aldridge is capable of being worn in a tactical situation in which a need for low visibility overrides a need for high visibility develops or is expected to develop. The military or paramilitary firefighter or emergency worker wearing the protective garment with the shell of high visibility facing outwardly may have an opportunity to doff the protective garment, to reverse the protective garment, and to redon the protective garment with the shell of low visibility facing outwardly.

In regard to claim 10, Aldridge teaches the shell of high visibility having reflective trim affixed thereto (30).

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alissa L. Hoey whose telephone number is (571) 272-4985. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00-5:30)Second Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Calvert can be reached on (571) 272-4983. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3765

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Alissa L. Hoey
Alissa L. Hoey
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 3700